The Dark Theater

Retaliation Litigation as Institutional Obstruction and Legalized Harassment

Authors: Ashley Gjovik, B.S., J.D. (ashleymgjovik@protonmail.com) | **Date**: May 26 2025

Abstract: Whistleblower retaliation litigation is widely treated as a conventional employment dispute governed by neutral procedural rules. But when the retaliation stems from disclosures involving fraud against the government or other public harms, the legal process transforms. This article argues that in such cases, employer defenses routinely operate not as good-faith rebuttals but as systems of institutional deceit—anchored in fraud, obstruction, and psychological warfare. Using interdisciplinary evidence from law, organizational psychology, feminist theory, and whistleblower trauma studies, the article shows how retaliation lawsuits become a second act of employer retaliation: one staged inside the courtroom and performed through false declarations, manipulated discovery, psychiatric weaponization, and narrative control.

The legal system, as currently structured, rewards institutional dishonesty and punishes moral dissent. Judges frequently defer to employer narratives, minimize discovery abuse, and fail to sanction perjury or obstructive filings—even in the presence of falsified evidence. Meanwhile, whistleblowers are subjected to reputational erasure and emotional destabilization, often emerging from litigation more harmed than vindicated. Through the lens of "*derealization*" and "*impossible speech,*" this article reconceptualizes the courtroom not as a venue of truth, but as a stage where institutional betrayal is performed as law.

The article concludes with policy proposals for structural reform, including mandatory DOJ referrals for litigation fraud, discovery oversight mechanisms, trauma-informed legal processes, and the reclassification of whistleblower retaliation as a public law harm. Until such reforms are enacted, the legal system will remain a site of ritualized injustice, in which truth is discredited, and power narrates its own exoneration.

Keywords: whistleblower retaliation; retaliation litigation; institutional gaslighting; legal system complicity; procedural violence; derealization; narrative control; discovery abuse; employer fraud; legalized obstruction

Citation: Gjovik, Ashley. "*The Dark Theater: Retaliation Litigation as Institutional Obstruction, and Legalized Harassment.*" The Journal of Structural Power & Resistance, Volume 1, Issue 1, Spring 2025, Silentium Fractum. May 26 2025. https://ashleygjovik.com.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 3

WHISTLEBLOWING AS DISRUPTION IN A NEOLIBERAL LEGAL ORDER 3

EMPLOYER LEGAL DEFENSE AS FRAUD AND OBSTRUCTION 4

GASLIGHTING, DEREALIZATION, AND PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE 5

RETALIATION THROUGH PROCEDURE: LEGAL VIOLENCE AND THE TRAP OF LITIGATION 5

THE ROLE OF SILENCE 6

LEGAL SYSTEM COMPLICITY AND STRUCTURAL IMPUNITY 6

THE FORGOTTEN HARM: HOW RETALIATION LITIGATION ERASES THE PROTECTED ACTIVITY 7

POLICY AND STRUCTURAL REFORM PROPOSALS 8

- Mandate Adverse Inference and Burden-Shifting in Fraud Cases 8
- Automatic DOJ Referral for Employer Misconduct 8
- Discovery Monitoring and Special Masters in Retaliation Cases 8
- Psychological Integrity Protections for Whistleblowers 8
- Reclassify Whistleblower Retaliation as a Public Law Harm 8

CONCLUSION: RETALIATION LITIGATION AS STATE-ENABLED INSTITUTIONAL BETRAYAL 9

REFERENCES 9

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 10

Introduction

In the architecture of American civil law, whistleblower retaliation claims are treated as conventional employment disputes, adjudicated within an adversarial system designed to weigh narratives, assess burdens, and resolve wrongs through compensatory relief. But when the retaliation stems from disclosures involving violations of federal law—fraud, safety breaches, or constitutional violations—the litigation ceases to function as a neutral forum. It becomes instead a continuation of the original wrongdoing, performed through law.

This article contends that in high-stakes retaliation cases, the employer's legal defense often transforms into a system of fraud, obstruction, and institutional gaslighting, disguised as litigation strategy. Rather than rebutting the allegations in good faith, the employer frequently submits false declarations, falsified records, and strategic misrepresentations to courts and agencies. Discovery is manipulated, evidence is withheld or destroyed, and retaliatory accusations of litigation misconduct are engineered to discredit the plaintiff and bury the underlying claim. These are not anomalies or excesses of advocacy—they are core features of how institutions defend themselves against morally disruptive truth.

This practice is not only legally corrosive; it is morally devastating. The whistleblower, often acting at great personal risk to protect public interest, is forced to relive the retaliation inside the courtroom—this time under the imprimatur of legal process. The fraudulent defenses that follow serve not merely to avoid liability but to derealize the truth, reshaping the public record into a lie. What courts call "*defense*" is often a performance of institutional power against individual dissent, enabled by procedural norms that privilege formalism over epistemic justice.

Existing legal scholarship rarely addresses this dynamic as a systemic pathology. Doctrines such as "*fraud on the court,*" obstruction statutes, or anti-perjury rules are largely disconnected from civil employment litigation. Judicial culture often assumes that both sides are engaged in symmetrical contestation, despite widespread evidence that employers in retaliation suits frequently control the narrative, the records, and the rules of access. Meanwhile, whistleblower protection statutes offer minimal structural safeguards and almost no consequences for employer deception during litigation.

This article seeks to reframe retaliation litigation as a form of state-enabled institutional deceit, in which the legal system, as currently designed, fails to adjudicate truth and instead legitimizes the lie. It begins by situating whistleblowing within a broader political and philosophical frame: as a moral act of institutional dissent, not merely a private complaint. It then maps how employer defenses evolve into multi-layered systems of fraud and obstruction, supported by documented legal tactics. Drawing on psychological literature, feminist legal theory, whistleblower trauma research, and first-person accounts, the article exposes how litigation becomes a site of psychological abuse and derealization. Finally, it proposes structural reforms to restore the judiciary's function as a truth-seeking institution, including mandatory fraud audits, burden-shifting mechanisms, and criminal referrals for litigation misconduct in retaliation suits.

In what follows, the legal process is not defended. It is interrogated. This article does not ask how whistleblowers can better survive litigation; it asks why the law so often colludes in their erasure.

Whistleblowing as Disruption in a Neoliberal Legal Order

Whistleblowing is often framed as an act of corporate compliance or internal accountability. But in truth, it functions more like institutional disobedience—a direct challenge to the internal rationalities and mythologies of the modern organization. Especially when disclosures involve fraud against the government, constitutional violations, or public safety threats, the whistleblower exposes not just wrongdoing but institutional hypocrisy: the gap between what organizations say they are and what they actually do.

This tension becomes especially volatile under neoliberal legalism, where the dominant imperative is risk minimization, reputational control, and output efficiency—not moral integrity. Within such systems, loyalty is conflated with silence, and the internal rule-following takes precedence over external truth. Whistleblowers, then, are not merely seen as disrupters—they are existential threats to institutional legitimacy.

As Judith Butler argues, neoliberal power depends on the ability to determine whose lives are grievable, and whose harms are legible (Butler 1997). In this frame, whistleblowers are rendered "*ungrievable subjects*": their losses are delegitimized, their motives pathologized, and their speech deemed irrational. This process, which Varman and Al-Amoudi describe as "*derealization*," functions to protect the institution by structurally erasing the whistleblower's moral claim (Varman and Al-Amoudi 2017).

The act of whistleblowing is therefore both epistemic and political. It does not merely report an illegal fact; it shatters

a controlled narrative, often forcing the institution to face not just liability but moral incoherence. This explains why whistleblowers—even when protected by statute—are so often met with aggressive retaliation.

Research shows that whistleblowers often come forward not out of self-interest, but from a sense of civic duty or ethical compulsion (Saade 2023). Yet this ethical gesture is immediately cast as deviant behavior within managerial logic. As Kenny argues, whistleblowers speak in a way that is "*impossible*" within institutional grammars (Kenny 2018). Their truth cannot be received because it cannot be processed without undoing the self-image of the organization itself.

As a result, whistleblowers are isolated, often framed as emotionally unstable or professionally incompetent. Many are subjected to covert psychiatric undermining, both in the workplace and later in court, where mental health records are weaponized to delegitimize their claim (Kenny, Fotaki, and Scriver 2019). This is not collateral damage—it is part of the institutional response, aimed at invalidating the actor so the institution can preserve itself.

Thus, the whistleblower is not just a legal claimant. They are a philosophical antagonist—someone whose existence threatens the institutional fiction of virtue. And once that threat enters the courtroom, the system must either reckon with the truth—or, more often, move to silence it.

Employer Legal Defense as Fraud and Obstruction

When an employer has retaliated against a whistleblower, particularly one who disclosed violations of federal law, their legal defense typically involves far more than denial. It becomes an active system of misrepresentation, a performance designed to replace the moral record of what happened with a legally sanctioned lie. In these cases, the defense strategy is not merely adversarial—it is a continuation of the original wrongdoing through procedural and evidentiary fraud.

The first layer of fraud is the fabrication of a pretextual reason for the adverse action. Employers often assert that the employee was fired, demoted, or disciplined due to "*performance issues,*" "*insubordination*," or "*personality conflicts*," despite the existence of internal documents showing the real motive was the protected disclosure (Miceli, Near, and Dworkin 2008).

These false justifications are commonly paired with post hoc documentation: performance write-ups, disciplinary memos, and retrospective narratives created or curated after the retaliation to support the invented rationale (Saade 2023).

The second layer of fraud occurs inside the courtroom and during discovery. Employers routinely submit sworn declarations that contradict the record, misrepresent facts in pleadings, and withhold exculpatory materials that would corroborate the employee's version of events (Sanjour 2013). In many instances, they solicit or pressure other employees to submit statements supporting the false narrative (Kenny 2018).

These tactics constitute what the Supreme Court has termed *"fraud on the court"*—the intentional corruption of the judicial process through deceit (*Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co*. 1944).

In the regulatory realm, the deception extends to federal agencies. Employers frequently submit position statements to the EEOC or OSHA that include factual inaccuracies, omissions, or outright fabrications. These statements are treated as reliable evidence by courts and can influence agency decisions that undermine the employee's credibility before a lawsuit even begins (Petruzzi and Kirshner 2015).

When this conduct occurs in criminal proceedings, it would plainly meet the standard for obstruction of justice under 18 U.S.C. § 1505 and § 1519, or false statements to the government under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. Yet in civil retaliation cases, this same conduct is normalized as "*zealous litigation.*" The employer, having retaliated, is permitted to construct an entire fictional world, and the court—constrained by procedural formalism and asymmetric information—often accepts it as plausible.

Psychologically, this process enacts a form of institutional gaslighting. As Kenny and colleagues describe, employers often engage in deliberate reputational erasure, reframing the whistleblower as paranoid, unstable, or disruptive (Kenny, Fotaki, and Scriver 2019). This is later replicated in court through requests for mental health records, psychiatric evaluations, and character smearing. The goal is not only to win the case, but to obliterate the moral standing of the whistleblower.

This form of fraud has no meaningful consequences. Perjury is rarely investigated. Rule 11 sanctions are virtually never imposed against employers in retaliation litigation. Courts routinely ignore patterns of misrepresentation unless the deceit is caught and proven through rare smoking-gun evidence. The legal system, in effect, incentivizes obstruction so long as it is wrapped in the language of procedural compliance.

Thus, the employer's defense in a retaliation suit is not just a legal position. It is a political act: a defense of the institution's legitimacy, achieved by discrediting the truth-

teller and reconstructing reality to fit the needs of power.

Gaslighting, Derealization, and Psychological Abuse

Beyond factual misrepresentation and legal obstruction, employers often escalate retaliation within the litigation process itself, engaging in a form of procedural psychological warfare. What follows is not just adversarial strategy, it is systematic derealization, in which the whistleblower's identity, memory, and mental health are distorted, undermined, and ultimately weaponized against them. This stage constitutes a second retaliation, now performed under the protection of court rules.

Whistleblowers often describe post-retaliation litigation as more traumatic than the retaliation itself (Van der Velden, Das, and Bosmans 2019). This is not incidental. The employer, having committed the initial wrongdoing, now seeks to destroy the legitimacy of the person who revealed it. This is done through coordinated tactics: allegations of litigation misconduct, manufactured discovery disputes, extensive psychological probing, and procedural sabotage.

The gaslighting begins with procedural manipulation. Employers obstruct discovery, delay document production, then blame the employee for being unprepared or uncooperative. In some cases, they intentionally miscommunicate about deadlines or withhold necessary records, only to later accuse the plaintiff of spoliation or discovery abuse. (Miceli, Near, and Dworkin 2008). These engineered crises are then used to justify motions to dismiss or sanctions, flipping the script to make the whistleblower appear deceptive, incompetent, or aggressive.

Meanwhile, the employer initiates invasive discovery designed to shame or destabilize. Plaintiffs are asked to provide years of mental health records, social media content, employment history, and even submit to psychological evaluations. Courts rarely scrutinize the necessity of these requests, treating them as neutral fact-finding rather than what they often are: covert character attacks and gross invasions of personal privacy. (Kenny, Fotaki, and Scriver 2019).

This strategy is particularly acute for women, who are more likely to face psychiatric framing, emotional invalidation, and character smearing. Research shows that female whistleblowers experience more severe and more personalized retaliation. (Saade 2023). The litigation process magnifies this dynamic, using credibility challenges and gender-coded attacks to erode both public and internal self-trust.

The psychological toll of this process is immense. Studies have found that whistleblowers exhibit PTSD rates equivalent to or greater than war veterans and terminal cancer patients (Van der Velden, Das, and Bosmans 2019). Symptoms include hypervigilance, dissociation, insomnia, and profound social withdrawal—often worsened by judicial indifference or implicit collusion in the employer's narrative framing.

This form of retaliation is structurally unpunished. Judges rarely intervene in bad-faith discovery or dismiss retaliatory requests for psychiatric records. There are no institutional protocols to identify when an employer is using litigation as psychological violence. The whistleblower is left alone, both in argument and in reality, facing a system that not only fails to stop abuse—but becomes the site through which it is enacted.

Retaliation Through Procedure: Legal Violence and the Trap of Litigation

Retaliation litigation is not only a site of narrative manipulation and gaslighting—it is often a space of intentional legal violence, where employers use procedure not merely to defend, but to punish. Their goal may be to secure dismissal, but their tactics reveal a broader ambition: to injure, exhaust, and erase the whistleblower. This violence is not incidental to litigation—it is engineered into its structure, weaponized through filings, deadlines, motions, and silence.

Every procedural event becomes a vector of harm. Employers demand invasive discovery—mental health records, financial history, communications with family, therapy notes—not because they are relevant, but because they destabilize. They subpoena new employers to sabotage reputations. They file motions accusing the whistleblower of misconduct, delay, or bad faith, even when the employer has manufactured the very delays and conflicts they then cite. These are not only legal strategies; they are forms of institutional aggression.

Worse still, the whistleblower cannot easily escape. Once a claim is filed in federal court, the plaintiff cannot simply withdraw without risk. Under Rule 41 and related doctrines, employers can—and often do—seek sanctions or attorney's fees if the case is voluntarily dismissed. What should be a right to retreat becomes a procedural threat. The result is a kind of legal captivity: the whistleblower is trapped inside a machine that hurts them whether they proceed or stop. There is no off-ramp, no dignified exit—only submission or collapse.

Even with legal representation, the whistleblower may be

powerless to stop the harm. Many do not understand civil procedure. They do not see the strategic uses of delay, or the reputational violence of psychiatric framing, until it is too late. And their lawyers—bound to the adversarial game and incentivized by contingency fees—may discourage them from intervening, speaking out, or redirecting the case. Some attorneys pursue efficiency over truth, settlement over vindication, and control over collaboration. The result is often devastating: a retraumatized truth-teller, watching from the sidelines as their reality is dismantled in the name of advocacy.

This legal violence is compounded by the judiciary's passivity. Judges may view the motions and countermotions as standard adversarial noise, failing to recognize the deeper structure: that this litigation is being used not just to resist liability, but to complete the retaliation. The lawsuit becomes a second abuse—a theater of controlled harm where the whistleblower is punished not for losing, but for speaking in the first place.

What emerges is a procedural paradox: you cannot escape the violence without risking more violence. The whistleblower cannot move forward without enduring psychological attacks but cannot move backward without incurring financial ruin. This is not justice..

The Role of Silence

Retaliation litigation rarely ends with a trial. It ends in silence. But that silence is not a neutral outcome. It is often the final act in the institution's strategy: a systematic disappearance of truth, achieved through procedural control, psychological attrition, and legal agreements designed to contain the threat the whistleblower represents.

One of the most powerful tools used to engineer this silence is the blanket protective order. Employers petition courts for protective orders early in discovery—ostensibly to try to shield trade secrets or sensitive HR material—but then apply them to virtually all documents produced, regardless of content. These orders become catch-all cloaks, preventing whistleblowers from sharing even basic evidence of misconduct with journalists, friends, or advocacy groups. In effect, protective orders create private law silos: closed legal spaces where the truth can be known but never spoken.

The same logic extends into settlement. The vast majority of retaliation cases, especially those involving serious harm, are resolved through confidential settlement agreements. These agreements often include:

- **Non-disclosure clauses** prohibiting the employee from discussing the facts of the case.
- **Non-disparagement clauses**, effectively gagging public commentary on institutional misconduct.
- **No-rehire clauses**, which blackball the whistleblower from the industry they worked in.

These provisions are not benign. They are legal erasures, crafted to eliminate not just the claim but the claimant. The institution preserves its public image. The record is sealed. The truth-teller disappears. Courts rarely intervene, even when these agreements perpetuate retaliation by ensuring the whistleblower remains unemployed, silenced, and isolated.

In some cases, whistleblowers sign these agreements under coercive conditions: facing mounting legal fees, deteriorating mental health, and the threat of countersuit or sanctions. Others do so without full knowledge of what they are giving up, especially when plaintiff-side counsel pushes for fast resolution to secure a contingency fee. The result is a legal fiction: a case "*resolved*" not through accountability, but through containment.

This procedural and contractual silencing serves a broader institutional function. It ensures that:

- The wrongdoing remains non-precedential.
- The whistleblower remains unreliable or invisible.
- The institution retains total narrative control.

As a consequence, courts become not venues of public record, but sealed rooms of procedural forgetting. The litigation was never about the truth. It was about neutralizing the one person who could name it.

Protective orders and settlement clauses are thus not technicalities. They are ideological tools, through which legal systems help institutions convert dissent into disappearance. If the law is to serve justice—not just reputation management, it must confront how often it becomes an accomplice to silence.

Legal System Complicity and Structural Impunity

The acts of deception and psychological abuse carried out by employers during retaliation litigation are not merely tolerated by the legal system, they are often structurally enabled. From discovery rules to evidentiary burdens, civil procedure operates in a way that privileges institutional defendants, defers to employer narratives, and isolates whistleblowers. The result is not just a failure of justice, but a system that rewards fraud and punishes dissent under the guise of neutrality.

One of the most dangerous assumptions in employment litigation is that both parties enter the courtroom with

comparable power, credibility, and access to evidence. In retaliation cases, this is patently false. Employers control personnel records, email systems, and internal investigative procedures. They can shape or suppress key documents, coach or coerce co-workers, and retain legal teams before the employee even files a claim. Courts nonetheless apply discovery burdens symmetrically, forcing whistleblowers to prove intent, falsity, and causality without the very tools they need to do so (Miceli, Near, and Dworkin 2008).

When employees do succeed in uncovering evidence of falsification or deceit, courts rarely interpret it as obstruction. Instead, judges treat employer misstatements as routine litigation tactics. Perjury in declarations, contradictory performance records, or misleading communications with federal agencies are almost never prosecuted, even when demonstrably false. There are virtually no instances in which an employer facing a proven retaliation finding is referred to the Department of Justice for submitting false statements under 18 U.S.C. § 1001 or § 1519 (Petruzzi and Kirshner 2015).

Nor are there institutional checks to detect patterns of abuse. Unlike in criminal law, there is no equivalent of prosecutorial oversight or grand jury review to test the veracity of employer filings in civil retaliation claims. Judges are left to rely on motions and countermotions, and few have the resources or inclination to treat employer discovery misconduct as systemic rather than adversarial. As William Sanjour's EPA testimony revealed, agencies themselves may be complicit in hiding evidence, deleting documents, or facilitating internal cover-ups (Sanjour 2013). Yet courts rarely question the credibility of institutions, even when whistleblowers present extensive documentary support.

This legal blindness is compounded by a cultural tendency to defer to organizational narratives. Whistleblowers, by contrast, are often cast as disgruntled, unstable, or acting out of revenge. The social psychology of the courtroom—combined with the employer's control over documentation—frequently tips the interpretive scales against the employee. As Kenny (2018) argues, the speech acts of whistleblowers are is "*impossible speech*" and is rendered legally invisible, while the employer's procedural fluency legitimizes their falsehoods.

This is what makes civil litigation such a dangerous site for whistleblowers. The law presumes good faith by default, and institutions weaponize this presumption to protect themselves. Procedural rules become instruments of obfuscation; discovery becomes a terrain of asymmetric warfare; and judicial neutrality becomes a cover for institutional loyalty. When this dynamic is allowed to play out unexamined, the courtroom ceases to be a venue for truth—and becomes a dark theater where silence is scripted and dissent is erased.

The Forgotten Harm: How Retaliation Litigation Erases the Protected Activity

At the center of every retaliation claim is a protected activity: a disclosure of wrongdoing. A safety report. A fraud alert. A civil rights violation. A constitutional breach. Yet once the lawsuit begins, that original act of conscience is often sidelined—or intentionally erased—from the legal record.

This erasure is not incidental. It is procedural. In retaliation cases, employers may move to exclude evidence of the underlying misconduct from trial on the grounds that it is "*not relevant*" to whether retaliation occurred.

Under prevailing doctrine, retaliation is treated as a standalone employment harm, mostly distinct from the content of the complaint that prompted it. Ultimately, what matters is not what the whistleblower said—but whether the employer's stated reason for firing them can be proven false.

As a result, the substance of the whistleblowing itself may never adjudicated. Jurors may never learn what the employee actually reported. Courts may bar evidence about the employer's wrongdoing. Even agency findings of probable cause or internal audits confirming the disclosure may be excluded from trial as prejudicial. The law isolates the retaliation from the reason it was inflicted—a clean procedural cordoning that severs moral context from legal remedy.

This erasure has two devastating effects.

First, it invalidates the whistleblower's moral purpose. The law invites the public to see them as merely an aggrieved former employee, not a citizen acting to prevent fraud, harm, or abuse. It reframes their act of conscience as a workplace dispute, thereby shrinking its public significance and making the retaliator's narrative easier to accept.

Second, it leaves the original harm unaddressed. Rarely does anyone return to ask:

- Was the fraud ever stopped?
- Were the safety conditions ever fixed?
- Were the civil rights ever restored?
- Are people still being harmed?

In many cases, the answer is unknown. The whistleblower

is gone. The litigation is sealed. And the actual underlying misconduct, the thing that started it all, has vanished from the public record. Institutions learn not how to fix problems, but how to remove the people who notice them.

This is the final betrayal: that the protected activity, which federal law claims to valorize, becomes inadmissible in the very proceeding meant to protect it. The legal system doesn't just fail to prevent retaliation—it participates in forgetting the reason it happened.

Policy and Structural Reform Proposals

The systemic failure of retaliation litigation—where employer fraud is tolerated, whistleblower trauma is ignored, and courts enable institutional gaslighting—demands more than doctrinal refinement. It requires structural realignment: a reengineering of how truth, power, and protection are conceptualized in the legal process.

Current remedies assume that if whistleblowers receive backpay or are reinstated, justice has been served. But this model fails to address the institutional deceit, psychological abuse, and public interest betrayal that define retaliation in its most damaging forms and the severe harm it can cause.

Mandate Adverse Inference and Burden-Shifting in Fraud Cases

When an employer is found to have fabricated evidence, withheld records, or submitted materially false statements in a retaliation case, the burden should shift. Courts must treat proven fraud on the court not as an evidentiary hiccup, but as a reason to presume the underlying retaliation occurred. This would align retaliation cases with other areas of law—such as spoliation doctrine in tort litigation—where deceit has structural consequences (Miceli, Near, and Dworkin 2008).

This shift is not radical. It is a recognition that truth cannot flourish under asymmetry, and that the side caught lying should not be presumed credible. Without such mechanisms, employers will continue to treat litigation fraud as risk-free.

Automatic DOJ Referral for Employer Misconduct

Perjury, obstruction of justice, and false statements to government agencies are federal crimes. When retaliation plaintiffs uncover clear evidence that employers lied to courts or regulators, these cases should automatically trigger referrals to the Department of Justice. Civil courts, while not criminal prosecutors, are nonetheless part of the judicial system—and cannot continue to function as zones of procedural immunity for institutional actors (Petruzzi and Kirshner 2015).

Even if prosecution does not follow, formal referral processes would apply public scrutiny and investigative oversight, breaking the pattern of silent complicity that surrounds so much of retaliation litigation.

Discovery Monitoring and Special Masters in Retaliation Cases

Given the well-documented patterns of employer manipulation during discovery—such as document suppression, misleading disclosures, and false psychiatric narratives—courts should appoint independent discovery monitors or special masters in complex retaliation cases. These actors could oversee requests for mental health records, assess claims of privilege, and review withheld materials in camera.

This proposal draws from judicial practices in mass torts, financial fraud, and police misconduct litigation, where truth is too valuable to leave to adversarial manipulation alone (Kenny, Fotaki, and Scriver 2019).

Psychological Integrity Protections for Whistleblowers

Current litigation frameworks treat whistleblower mental health disclosures as fair game. Employers exploit this by demanding therapy notes, character depositions, and psychiatric exams—not to understand trauma, but to delegitimize the claimant. This is a form of secondary retaliation. It requires explicit protection.

Courts should impose strict limits on what mental health records are discoverable and prohibit psychiatric examinations unless compelling, specific evidence justifies them. Whistleblowers should also be offered trauma-informed legal processes, including the right to adversarial shielding during cross-examination when emotional harm is central to the claim (Van der Velden, Das, and Bosmans 2019).

Reclassify Whistleblower Retaliation as a Public Law Harm

Finally, retaliation for reporting fraud against the government, safety risks, or human rights abuses is not merely a private employment dispute; it is an attack on democratic accountability. Civil litigation should reflect this.

Just as certain crimes trigger automatic victim notification, retaliation should trigger public interest protections, including amicus opportunities for public agencies, and mandatory public findings when employer misconduct is proven. Whistleblowers are, in effect, deputized agents of

the public good. Their protection should not hinge solely on private rights of action.

Conclusion: Retaliation Litigation as State-Enabled Institutional Betrayal

Retaliation litigation in the United States is often framed as a neutral adjudication of workplace disputes—a procedural question of who said what, and why. But in reality, it is something far more consequential: a performance of institutional power, in which employers who have committed wrongdoing are permitted to rewrite the moral and factual record, and courts too often act as a passive stage.

Whistleblowers do not just report violations; they threaten the symbolic order of the institutions they serve. They reveal not just errors, but hypocrisies. For this, they are not merely fired, they are derealized. Their claims are reframed as delusions, their motives as bitterness, their character as defective.

The retaliation continues through depositions, discovery abuse, and psychiatric weaponization. In the end, many are driven not only from their jobs, but from their professions, and their communities. Many also lose their public credibility and existing reputation. Some even lose their lives due to the employer's violence.

This is not a flaw in the system. It is a feature of its current design. The legal system, in its commitment to adversarialism and formal neutrality, becomes an enabler of obstruction and fraud.

It fails not only to protect whistleblowers, but to recognize that retaliation litigation is a second act of harm, a space where truth is not tested but buried.

If courts are to function as venues of justice rather than as instruments of silence, the system must change. Whistleblower retaliation must be treated not just as private harm but as a public threat. Until then, retaliation litigation will remain what it too often is today: a dark theater.

References

Al-Amoudi, Ismael, and Mahesh Varman. "Accumulation through Derealization: How Corporate Violence Remains Unaccounted For." *Human Relations* 70, no. 3 (2017): 263–86.

Alam, H. Shaik Md Noor. 2019. "Whistleblowing When It Hurts: Whistleblower Gaslighting and Institutional Secrecy." In *Law, Environment and Society*, edited by H. Kamaruddin, S. Tan, and R.X. Thambusamy, 123–129. *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, vol. 70.

Bandura, Albert. "Moral Disengagement in the Perpetration of Inhumanities." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 3, no. 3 (1999): 193–209.

Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.

Devine, Tom. 2011. *The Corporate Whistleblower's Survival Guide: A Handbook for Committing the Truth*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Fotaki, Marianna. 2015. "Whistleblowing and Mental Health: A New Weapon for Retaliation." In *Developments in Whistleblowing Research*, edited by D. Lewis, 106–121. International Whistleblowing Research Network.

Garrick, Jacqueline, and Martina Buck. 2020. "Whistleblower Retaliation Checklist: A New Instrument for Identifying Retaliatory Tactics and Their Psychosocial Impacts after an Employee Discloses Workplace Wrongdoing." *Culture, Society & Health Research* 2 (2): 76–93.

Kenny, Kate. "Censored: Whistleblowers and Impossible Speech." *Human Relations* 71, no. 8 (2018): 1025–1048.

Kenny, Kate, Marianna Fotaki, and Susan Scriver. "Mental Health as a Weapon: Whistleblower Retaliation and Normative Violence." *Journal of Business Ethics* 160, no. 3 (2019): 801–15.

Kohn, Stephen M. 2011. *The Whistleblower's Handbook: A Step-by-Step Guide to Doing What's Right and Protecting Yourself*. Guilford, CT: Lyons Press.

Miceli, Marcia P., Janet P. Near, and Terry Morehead Dworkin. *Whistle-Blowing in Organizations*. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Petruzzi, Anthony, and Elizabeth Kirshner. "Criminalizing Whistleblower Retaliation: 18 U.S.C. § 1513(e) and Its Practical Challenges." *Bloomberg BNA White Collar Crime Report*, July 2015.

Saade, Mary. "Women & Whistleblowing." *Hastings Women's Law Journal* 34, no. 1 (2023): 43–61.

Sanjour, William. *William Sanjour Memoir: Thirty Years Fighting Pollution Inside EPA.* Self-published, 2013.

Sumanth, John J., David M. Mayer, and Virginia S. Kay. "Why Good Guys Finish Last: The Role of Justification Motives, Cognition, and Emotion in Predicting Retaliation against Whistleblowers." *Organizational Psychology Review* 1, no. 2 (2011): 165–84.

Van der Velden, Peter G., Marcel Das, and Mark Bosmans.

"The Burden of Whistleblowing: A Two-Wave Study of the Effects of Retaliation, Organizational Response, and Support on Health Consequences of Whistleblowing." *Journal of Business Ethics* 156, no. 3 (2019): 857–74.

Varman, Mahesh, and Ismael Al-Amoudi. "Accumulation through Derealization." *Human Relations* 70, no. 3 (2017): 263–86.

U.S. Supreme Court. *Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.*, 322 U.S. 238 (1944).

Acknowledgements

The author conceptualized the article, developed the theoretical framework, and conducted the review and synthesis of literature. This research received no external funding. All materials, equipment, and resources used in the study were personally funded by the author.